

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, JONES, KOLBE, STUMP, HILLEARY and GIBBONS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2145

MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1998, OFFERED BY MR. MINGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2400) offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The Clerk will designate the motion to instruct.

The Clerk designated the motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 251, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—156

Andrews	DeGette	Kennelly
Archer	Doggett	Kind (WI)
Baker	Dooley	Kingston
Ballenger	Dreier	Klecza
Barr	Edwards	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Ehrlich	LaFalce
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	Lantos
Bartlett	Ensign	Largent
Barton	Eshoo	LaTourette
Bentsen	Etheridge	Leach
Bilbray	Evans	Levin
Boyd	Everett	Lewis (GA)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Lofgren
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Lucas
Burr	Fox	Luther
Campbell	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Canady	Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Cannon	Goss	McCollum
Cardin	Graham	McDermott
Carson	Hall (TX)	McIntosh
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Chabot	Hayworth	McKinney
Chenoweth	Hefner	Meehan
Christensen	Hergert	Mica
Clayton	Hill	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hilleary	Minge
Coburn	Hobson	Morella
Combest	Hoekstra	Myrick
Condit	Hooley	Nethercutt
Costello	Hoyer	Neumann
Cox	Hulshof	Norwood
Crane	Hunter	Nussle
Crapo	Hutchinson	Obey
Cubin	Inglis	Paul
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pickett
Davis (FL)	Jones	Pomeroy
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Porter
Deal	Kennedy (RI)	Portman

Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough

Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns

Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Turner
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Wexler
Weygand
Wolf

White
Wise

Woolsey
Wynn

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Peterson (MN) Sabo

NOT VOTING—24

Bateman	McCrery	Stark
Berman	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Deutsch	Meeks (NY)	Torres
Foley	Moran (VA)	Towns
Gonzalez	Ney	Waxman
Harman	Parker	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Wicker
Manzullo	Skaggs	Yates

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Chambliss
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Engel
English
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson

Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowe
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)

Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Serrano
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeean
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stabenow
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

□ 2153

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Messrs. BISHOP, GEJDENSON, MILLER of California, and ROTHMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ROGAN, SPRATT, FOX of Pennsylvania, and EVERETT changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 119, PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING, AND H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 442 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 442

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit campaign spending. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative DeLay of Texas or his designee and a Member in favor of the joint resolution. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. During consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Chairman of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 or rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of

questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments in the nature of a substitute specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed in the Congressional Record or his designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a substitute amendment or to a perfecting amendment carrying a tax or tariff measure. During consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole, all points of order against each amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in the report are waived. Consideration of each amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in the report shall begin with an additional period of general debate, which shall be confined to the subject of the amendment and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Member who caused the amendment to be printed in the Congressional Record or his designee and an opponent. During consideration of amendments to an amendment in the nature of a substitute, or of other amendments to the bill, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that allows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments

as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment to the bill reported from the Committee of the Whole or to an amendment in the nature of a substitute finally adopted and reported to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 2200

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

I would like to begin by saying it is my understanding that the only debate tonight will be on the rule with a prospective vote perhaps on the rule, and all general debate will be tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 442 provides for the consideration of H. J. Res. 119 under an open amending process with one hour of general debate equally divided between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and a Member in favor of the joint resolution. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and allows the chairman to postpone votes and reduce the voting time to 5 minutes if the postponed vote follows a 15-minute vote.

On the joint resolution, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2183 under a modified open amendment process any time after the adoption of the rule.

H. Res. 442 provides for two hours of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight. Following the two hours of general debate, the rule provides for consideration of the 11 amendments in the nature of a substitute specified in the Committee on Rules report. In order to allow for consideration of as many alternatives as possible, the Committee on Rules has waived all points of order against each of the amendments in the nature of a substitute. Under this very fair, open rule, each amendment in the nature of a substitute may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or his designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a substitute amendment or perfecting amendment carrying a tariff or tax provision.

Mr. Speaker, we have provided one hour of general debate at the beginning of consideration of each of the 11 substitutes, which shall be equally divided

and controlled by the Member who caused the amendment to be printed in the RECORD or his designee and an opponent. The rule permits the Chair to accord priority in recognition to preprinted amendments and allows the Chair to postpone votes during the bill's consideration.

Mr. Speaker, we do not allow the King of the Hill rule that the Democrats instituted for 40 years in an effort to subvert popular legislation and undermine free and open debate. Under H. Res. 442, the substitute that receives the most votes will be reported to the House. If more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House.

I am certain that I did not see this kind of process on campaign finance reform when the Democrats controlled the House. In fact, in my first year in this House, former Speaker Foley and the Democrat Committee on Rules muzzled the minority and forced a closed rule upon us. Not only were we allowed to offer only one amendment to the entire bill, but the Democrats refused to allow us a basic right to offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

A quick glance back in history shows that this was not simply an isolated incident but a pattern of suppressed debate on this issue in Democrat Congresses.

In the 102nd Congress, for example, the Democrats again stifled open and free debate with a similarly closed gag rule. I expect that the calls today will again be for a return to the days of closed rules and limited debate. The opponents of this open debate want us to close down the process, allow consideration of only one bill, and foreclose all other opinions on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that we present the House with a wide open amending process that allows each Representative the ability to amend and perfect each of the 11 campaign finance reform bills. This rule will create the most open debate process in the history of campaign reform, as was promised by the Speaker.

Although I am not as cynical as some on the subject of campaign finance reform, I agree that the system can be improved. However, the first amendment guarantees our right to express ourselves, and that right extends to political expression as well. Therefore, the right of Americans to contribute to political campaigns should not be infringed. Clearly, it is important for voters to know which individuals and which groups are financing a candidate. I have cosponsored legislation that ensures that voters know where that money is coming from and can act accordingly.

On the subject of free speech, the rule allows for consideration of a constitutional amendment that was originally introduced by the minority leader, the

gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), that would give Congress new power to regulate campaign expenditures. The Member offering that amendment, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), opposes it because it basically gives the Congress the authority to enact any legislation that may abridge an array of free speech and free association rights under the First Amendment. Nevertheless, under this open amendment process, the Committee on Rules wanted to allow a full debate on the measure.

I also think it should be noted that we need to deal with the problem of union money being funneled into races across the country. Despite their calls for reform, the \$400 million in union money that was dumped into the 1996 elections has been protected by Democrats against the will of hard-working American union members. If we are truly going to talk about reform, then we need to address how unions are using, for partisan political purposes, the paychecks of the union workers.

While I do not believe that major changes are necessary to the existing campaign finance laws, I do, however, believe that these existing campaign finance laws have been under assault since early 1996.

We have now found that two major Democrat donors benefited from an administration policy change that improved the accuracy of missiles pointed at American cities. Even some in the administration believe that the decision to provide American technology to China has put American national security at risk. Personally, I believe it would be more useful if we could get some kind of assurance that the current laws we have on the books are going to be honored. Nonetheless, the administration is calling for new reforms.

However, it should be noted that it is already illegal to funnel millions of dollars in foreign money into the United States electoral system as the Chinese did. It is already illegal to make fund-raising calls from Federal property. It is already improper to use the Lincoln bedroom and Air Force One for fund-raising activities, and it is also already illegal under current law to go to a Buddhist temple and accept illegal campaign funds.

These actions are already against the law, and they were shamelessly violated in 1996. Mr. Speaker, nothing in this new campaign reform legislation will matter if one party or the other simply decides that the law does not apply to them.

That is why our focus today should be on how current campaign finance law was so flagrantly violated. Unfortunately, we cannot get to the bottom of the 1996 campaign finance scandal because 91 witnesses who know the truth about campaign violations have either fled the country, refused to testify, or have taken the Fifth Amendment.

Amidst this enormous left wing coverup come the artificial calls for

campaign finance reform. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to consider campaign finance reform, this majority is committed to a process that allows for a full debate on the pertinent issues. This rule provides for that kind of open debate.

The rule for the campaign finance bill was favorably reported out of the Committee on Rules. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of each of the substitute campaign finance reform bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule proves once and for all that the Republican majority has no real interest in actually pursuing real campaign finance reform. Under the guise of full and free debate, the Republican majority has brought to the House a process which could in all probability take up weeks of the time we have left in this session of Congress and in the end might produce nothing.

Mr. Speaker, there are many points of view on this subject, but it does not serve the institution well, nor does it serve the American people well, to debate those views in a cynical process which is little more than a charade. The process the Republican majority has brought to the floor ensures that the House will not have the opportunity to have an up or down vote on either the bipartisan freshman proposal or the Shays-Meehan proposal.

This rule makes in order 11 substitutes to the freshman reform proposal, as well as the consideration of any germane amendment to each and every one of those substitutes. In essence, as each substitute is considered, the rule will allow multiple amendments to that substitute. In addition, it is anticipated that the Committee on Rules will meet again after the Memorial Day recess to report another rule which will make in order a number of nongermane amendments to the substitutes. Included in those nongermane amendments are a number of proposals which many Members in this House consider to be poison pill amendments.

After each substitute has been considered, whichever has received the most number of votes will be judged the winner. This may be an open process, Mr. Speaker, but I beg to differ with those who might characterize it as allowing the House to reach a decision when in fact it may be designed to do the very opposite.

To further compound the complication, the rule allows the House to bring up a constitutional amendment introduced but not supported by the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). The majority whip has called this proposal a "big brother" remedy, yet he came to the Committee on Rules yesterday to ask that it be made in order. Consideration of this constitutional amendment is just more

of the same attempt to divert the attention of the House and the American public from the real question: Do we want real campaign finance reform or do we not?

The Shays-Meehan proposal is considered by many outside good government groups to be true campaign finance reform. The bill bans soft money at the Federal and State level if those funds are used to influence Federal elections. The bill redefines express advocacy to include radio and television communications that refer to a clearly defined Federal candidate within 60 days of an election or that include unambiguous support or opposition to a Federal candidate outside the 60-day period.

All ads falling under this definition could only be run by using legal hard dollars. The bill clarifies the Pendleton Act restrictions on fund-raising on Federal property and bars political parties from making coordinated expenditures on behalf of candidates who do not limit spending their own money to \$50,000.

Finally, the Shays-Meehan proposal codifies the Beck decision that ensures that nonunion employees who pay union agency fees do not have to pay for union political activities.

Unfortunately, this bill does not contain a nonseverability clause. Should the Supreme Court find any essential part of this proposal to be unconstitutional, the remainder, however unbalanced or unwise because of the loss of that element, would remain the law of the land. Losing an essential element of Shays-Meehan would lead us right back to the situation in which we now find ourselves.

□ 2215

After the Supreme Court struck down one of the four essential pillars in *Buckley v. Valeo* in 1976, what was left was an unbalanced and unstable hodgepodge that gave us the quagmire we are trying to work our way out of today. If we are to consider amendments to these proposals, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that prominent among them should be one which provides for nonseverability.

The Shays-Meehan proposal represents a sea change in how Federal elections are conducted today, Mr. Speaker, and it deserves the opportunity to be fully and freely debated. Unfortunately, this rule does not provide that opportunity.

The freshman bipartisan bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), is also a proposal which would make significant changes in the way Federal election campaigns are conducted. The freshman proposal also bans national parties from accepting or raising soft money on behalf of the national committee or on behalf of State political parties. However, the freshman proposal does permit State political parties to continue to raise and spend soft money and use those funds for activities intended to affect Federal elections. These are significant changes,

Mr. Speaker, and deserve to be debated by this House.

The freshman proposal indexes for inflation the allowable amount of PAC and individual contributions into \$100 increments beginning in 1999 and increases the aggregate annual contribution limit from \$25,000 to \$50,000 each year, instead of election cycle, with a maximum of \$25,000 in donations to candidates and PACs, and a maximum of \$25,000 to political parties. This bill also raises PAC contributions to national parties from \$15,000 each election cycle to \$20,000 each calendar year and removes party candidate coordination limits.

Finally, the bill requires third-party advocacy groups who run issue ads on either television or radio to report expenditures of more than \$25,000 on a single candidate, or more than \$100,000 on multiple candidates. Failure to comply with the requirements set out in the bill could result in fines up to \$50,000. These changes, Mr. Speaker, are quite significant and do deserve to be fully and freely debated.

So, Mr. Speaker, some Democratic Members, in an effort to provide for debate on campaign finance reform that is not designed to derail the process, will vote against the previous question. They hope to amend this rule to provide for the kind of process that was set out in the discharge petition that came so close to reaching the requisite 218 signatures. They hope to allow the House to consider each substitute, and when the House has agreed to the substitute it wishes to work from, then consider amendments to that proposal. The Democratic rule is a much more reasonable process and one which will allow the House to choose within a reasonable period of time whether it wishes to pursue campaign finance or not.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard Mr. LINDER expound about things that are currently in the press related to China rather than talking about campaign finance reform. It is obvious that the Republicans do not want to deal with campaign finance reform. All they want to deal with is things that are in newspapers and on TV, whether they are substantiated or not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that the reason I raise the issue of Chinese money is it was a precise violation of current finance laws with respect to campaigning, and if they are not going to obey the current laws, how can we expect them to obey any future ones?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the rule.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his excellent work on the Committee on Rules and his efforts in regard to this rule and this legislation. And I

also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his commitment to a fair and open debate on campaign finance reform.

I am one of the lead sponsors of the bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, also known as the freshman bill, and I just want to congratulate my cosponsor, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TOM ALLEN), for his work, and the other Democrat freshmen that have worked so hard; as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. KEN HULSHOF), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KEVIN BRADY), the gentleman from Montana (Mr. RICK HILL), and so many other freshmen Republicans that have worked hard for over a year in developing a proposal that is bipartisan in formation and bipartisan in nature and it continues in a bipartisan fashion today. We have worked well together on this. So this is the base bill that is under consideration.

The rule before us allows for the consideration of 11 substitute amendments to the base bill. Those substitutes range from the commission bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. RICK WHITE), to the Paycheck Protection bill, offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFER). It allows votes on the vast range of reform bills, even the extremes, from the Doolittle bill, which removes all limits on contributions, to the Shays-Meehan bill, which is massive in terms of its regulatory control over issue advocacy groups. In other words, the rule is fair to all and will provide ample opportunity for debate on this critical issue.

What will the result be? Certainly it is unknown, and the amendment process is still up in the air. But I am hopeful that we can go through this process in a bipartisan fashion; that we will not be slamming each other throughout this but that we work to get the job done.

I believe the freshmen who came here believe that we are here to accomplish something and not get sidetracked on a multitude of issues. We need to start this and we need to finish it. I ask colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate all of the Members who signed the discharge petition, which has brought about this rule tonight and brought about the consideration of campaign reform. And in particular I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for all the work that he has done, and I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for all of the work and effort that he has put forth.

I want to thank the members of our Blue Dog coalition here in the Demo-

cratic Caucus and all the work that they have done. And I want to commend the freshmen on both sides who have worked so hard to see that this issue comes up.

In truth, this issue should have come up some months ago, when we had this tortured procedure of having a suspension. It is time for campaign reform. The reason the discharge petition got signed by so many Members, and the reason that so many Members in this body are for campaign reform is that its time has come. The American people want us to enact campaign reform. The perception in the country, right or wrong, is that money is the dominant feature of America's campaigns. People are sick of that. They want to have a control on the money.

I would simply say to the Members that I hope all of the Members will vote for the Shays-Meehan bill. The Shays-Meehan bill is, in my view, of all the bills, and I have worked on many of the bills that are going to be up, is the best bill. It is the first step that we can take. It gets rid of soft money, the large contributions which have been so dominant in this system. We need to take this first step.

It does something about outside expenditures, of outside independent groups coming in and spending thousands and thousands of dollars at the end of campaigns.

It does not do everything that should be done in campaign reform, but it is a solid first step. And I hope that every Democratic Member on my side of the aisle will support this legislation with their vote, and I hope Republicans will support it as well.

We should be able to get 218 votes on the floor of this House next month and we will make a blow for what the American people want to clean up this system and move it in the right direction.

Vote for the rule, vote for Shays-Meehan when we get that chance.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

My colleagues, I too rise in support of this rule, and I listened with great interest to the minority leader decry the current state and the perception of running for political office and raising funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are three words that sum up the essence of what is transpiring in the body politic today, and that is: Obey existing laws. That is what should be done. Sadly, because of an association with foreigners and foreign money, we now have serious allegations.

Rather than changing the rules, although I think we are all happy to do so under an open fashion, in stark contrast to what went on for some 40 years here before the new majority took control, we will have a chance to openly debate this, but make no mistake, my

colleagues, the most radical reform would be for my liberal friends and those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue to obey existing laws.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, every 2 years America's airwaves are flooded with political attack ads. These negative ads leave voters feeling cynical, disenchanted, and with little faith in politicians or in the political process.

These attack ads are also the main reason why we spend so much time fund-raising, defending ourselves against vicious 30-second spots, often now funded by outside groups, and have become more and more costly every single year and every single election. Free TV time for credible candidates could drastically lower the cost of campaigns and eliminate the need for excessive fund-raising.

The broadcasters and the radio folks and the TV folks and the cable folks, they do not own those airwaves. They belong to the American people, not the media corporations.

Under the current system, many people feel they have no political voice. No political voice at all unless they contribute \$50,000 or \$70,000 or \$100,000 to the major parties. And many public officials feel they have no choice but to court such contributions. This ends up excluding all but the wealthiest Americans from the political process, spawns investigation after investigation, and really eats away at the very heart of our democracy.

One of the reasons we are seeing the decline of people participating at the polls is because of this very system that we are forced to operate under. Look at what is happening in California where millionaires are duking it out to be governor, and the poor man in the race is spending \$8 million in the primary.

This Congress has the capacity to change that. We can dismantle the current system that, I daresay, very few of us like. We can restore the integrity of our elections. We can renew the faith of the voters. And the first important step on that path, the first important step in this process is passing a bipartisan bill, the Meehan-Shays bill.

This bill, as the leader said, would ban soft money, the huge contributions to political parties that really are just an end run around Federal contribution limits. This bill would require outside groups that run so-called issue advertisements to play by the same funding rules as the actual candidates. This bill would force timely disclosure of who is really funding campaigns so that the voters can make informed decisions about the information that they are getting.

□ 2230

Meehan/Shays will not solve our problems entirely, but it is a good first step. It will demonstrate that this Congress is committed to genuine reform;

and that is no small commitment for the Speaker, who, as the leader has said, has blocked reform at every step, who said that the problem with our political system is that we spend too little money.

It does not have to be that way. Raising more money to clean up politics would be like using a bucket of kerosene to put out a fire. But we can work together this week, next month in fixing the system.

Mr. Speaker, schedule a full and a fair debate on campaign finance reform. Americans will not accept any more political games, any more false delays, any more poison pills, any more sham reforms, any more gaming of the system. Give the Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, a clean up-or-down vote on Meehan/Shays. It is a fair, bipartisan approach; and it should be judged on its merits, nothing else.

The American people are watching. The Meehan/Shays is the one vote that will tell them everything. I urge my colleagues when we get to this debate to be vigilant and to stand with those who stand for reform.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, is soft money constitutionally protected? No, not exactly.

Are the political parties and others constitutionally protected to raise money in any amount from any sources? No, not exactly.

Many of those who will be arguing about soft money bans are going to claim that soft money is constitutionally protected, and they will be using an illusionist's sleight of tongue when they make that argument.

Some will refer to the Supreme Court decision in *Colorado v. FEC*. In that case, the Colorado Republican Party sued the FEC, saying that the Federal agency had no authority to regulate soft money issue advocacy campaigns.

Did the court sanction soft money in that decision? Well, no, not exactly. What it said was that the Federal Election Campaign Act permits unregulated soft money for some uses. It did not say it was a constitutional right. It simply said the Federal Election Campaign Act did not encompass soft money.

So what does the freshman bill do about soft money in Colorado? It says this. It says that the National Republican and Democratic Parties cannot give soft money to the Colorado State parties. It says that federal officeholders cannot raise soft money for those State parties. It says that Colorado cannot get soft money from another State party. And it ends money laundering.

But if the people of Colorado want the State parties to be able to raise and spend soft money, they can; and if they do not, they can stop it. That is what the tenth amendment is about,

letting States make decisions that impact the States.

The Supreme Court has said that limits on spending have serious constitutional problems because they restrict free speech. This bill does not limit spending. It places limits on contributions, which the Supreme Court has ruled is constitutional.

This freshman bill limits contributions by saying "no more soft money" to our national parties. No more corporate money. No more big labor money. No more laundering of money. And no limits on free speech.

I say, support the rule; defend the freshman rule. It is fair to both political parties. It meets constitutional muster, and it will restore integrity to campaigns.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, I would like to be here in the well tonight to congratulate the Republican leadership for finally relenting and allowing a fair debate on genuine campaign finance reform. Unfortunately, I cannot do it.

The Republican leadership want no part of campaign finance reform. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) repeatedly has said that not enough money is spent on political campaigns. He does not think that billions of dollars spent each year on 30-second negative TV spots is enough.

But this is the Speaker who made a promise in Claremont, New Hampshire, 3 years ago. He looked President Clinton straight in the eye, shook his hand, and promised to commit himself to campaign finance reform. We know the old phrase "a promise made, a promise broken."

Last winter, the Speaker made another promise. After the Senate began debate on campaign finance reform, he committed to have a vote on real campaign finance reform by the end of March. Well, instead, we got a rigged process and a phoney bill and a lot of bad press. Another promise made, another promise broken.

It brings us to today, after House Democrats from across the spectrum and a handful of Republicans forced the Speaker to promise a vote on real campaign reform by May 15. Well, check the calendar. It is May 21. And we are just beginning a debate 1 day before a 2-week recess, with no sign of a simple vote on campaign finance reform on the horizon. We are destined to be filler for the next several months. Another promise made, another promise broken.

What is the Republican leadership afraid of? Well, it is pretty obvious. They are afraid that campaign finance reform will pass. So they bottled it up, put it off and now, in their latest attempt to kill it, have made it complicated and cumbersome.

I think it is time we send the final message. Let us tell them that we want a straight up-or-down vote now on the

Meehan/Shays campaign reform bill. No more delay. No more technical mumbo-jumbo. No more broken promises.

I want my colleagues to know that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT); our Whip, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR); all of those who have worked on our side are asking for a no vote on the previous question as a way of explaining our frustration with a process that has not served not only this body but the American people well. Then perhaps should we prevail. We could have that vote up or down, as the American people deserve it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by congratulating the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) the representative of the Committee on Rules here, the gentleman who yielded to me. Because I think they did the right thing, and they have done something which I think all of us in this House should embrace who believe that we should have an open rule process for this in.

I have heard that there are supposed to be 500 amendments on this, and it is going to be a very difficult task to straighten out what we should be voting on and what we should not be voting on. But the bottom line is that the leadership and the Committee on Rules in particular heard the message here, and they have done a wonderful job, and I think they deserve the heartfelt thanks of all of us who have been campaigning for campaign finance reform in some way or another here in the last couple of years.

There are a lot of good bills which are here. I think the Freshman bill is a particularly good bill. I also happen to favor Meehan/Shays. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has done a much more exceptional job on campaign finance reform than anyone has given him credit for.

But I would caution each and every one of us as we enter into this fray I guess after we come back from the Memorial Day break that it is going to be very difficult to hold intact the concept of a majority for a particular bill that will be campaign finance reform and perhaps even more difficult to hold together a majority for the particular bill that one cares about.

And yet, in my judgment, there have been enough abuses, some maybe perfectly legal, as a matter of fact, and some perhaps even illegal, that the time has come in the United States of America when we all should look in the mirror.

I have a hunch that there is enough blame to go around from one political party or the other and perhaps from one candidate to another as we look across America. And I must say that most candidates live well within the rules, but there have been a lot of abuses and the time has come for us in the Congress of the United States to really focus on this issue.

So it is my hope as we stand here tonight that, first of all, we do adopt this rule. That is, ultimately, very, very important. And I hope we adopt it by a large majority. And that, secondly, we pay attention to this debate. And then, hopefully, when it is all said and done, we will have campaign finance reform in America.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, they said pigs would fly before we got an open debate on campaign finance reform in the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring home the bacon because we are here at last. After 4 years of promises made and promises broken, we are finally going to get a vote on Shays-Meehan.

Or are we? It is not all clear to me that this rule will allow for a vote on the Shays/Meehan bill, especially in light of the commitment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to essentially filibuster this bill by offering hundreds of amendments throughout the summer.

The Speaker's message is clear. He supports more money in campaigns, not less. He wants to enhance the role of wealthy special interests in congressional elections rather than diminish it. Well, the public clearly feels differently.

In a recent NBC Wall Street Journal poll, 92 percent of the American people felt that too much money was spent on campaigns. We are here today because the American voters demand that we fix a broken system.

Over the course of this debate, there will be many substitutes and many amendments. I urge all of my colleagues to remember that there is only one bill that is both bipartisan and bicameral and that will enact real campaign finance reform this year, there is only one bill that has the support of nearly every grassroots organization that is active on reform, and there is only one bill that has the support of editorial boards all across this country. That is the McCain/Feingold/Shays/Meehan bill.

Unlike the other substitutes and alternatives, only Shays-Meehan will conclusively ban soft money. Only Shays-Meehan will address the growing problem of third-party campaign advertisements and only Shays-Meehan will give the FEC the teeth it needs to prevent abuses in the current system.

Above all, our bill is a product of compromise. It will benefit neither party at the expense of the other. At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, a vote for campaign finance reform is a vote for Shays-Meehan.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule.

I guess I would like to say I guess it is better late than never. We should have had this debate last year. But at

least now, with this rule, we are about to have this debate. But, again, better late than never.

I think we must thank the Committee on Rules. It was a hard job to structure this rule. Given the complexities of the issues and the controversies generated, and we have heard some of them here tonight, and the interest groups that have been working at cross purposes here, I think it is probably the best vehicle that we could have supported.

Well, whatever one would say about that, the point is the time is now to deal with this issue and we can finally get at our campaign system that is clearly out of control. We can at least have an intelligent debate of sorts on this.

I think there are many critically important issues that we can discuss and examine during the course of this debate, some of them mentioned tonight. We must support this rule and, hopefully, pass Shays-Meehan in the end.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

The freshmen Democrats and the freshmen Republicans came together as our major undertaking in this class, all of us were involved in targeted races in the 1996 election, and we decided we were going to work together. It does not always happen in this House, but we decided to work together, and we put together H.R. 2183, the bipartisan freshman bill.

We are proud that that bill is the base bill for a debate in this Congress. We respect everything that other reformers have done, including the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) to bring this cause forward.

Now, we could look at this rule and say, "We are proud of this rule. It is going to give us the complete, open debate that we asked for." But when we look back at the history over the last month or two, we see an enormous reluctance to bring up campaign reform. We remember that when the Republican leadership tried to bring up a bill they tried to bring up a bogus reform bill that took two-thirds in order to pass. That was not the way, and the people of this country said, "No, that is bogus reform. We need real reform."

Now we have a rule that allows 11 substitutes and many amendments; and the question is, can this process be managed so we have a fair debate here on the floor so we can give the American people what they want? And what they want in every poll in every time we go back to our districts, they say, "There is too much money in politics. We have got to contain the money. We need campaign finance reform."

□ 2245

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot about people denouncing attack ads and independent expenditures and soft money, but it is interesting to me, not one person that has spoken has denied that money being spent in their district. They could very easily say, I do not want any of this money in my district, but none of these self-righteous people are doing that in their own districts.

We hear from many people too much is being spent. We also know that Americans spend about as much each year on yogurt and potato chips as we do on electing our officials. Are the proponents of limiting free speech and expenditures trying to tell the American people they spend too much money on yogurt?

They are going to come up next and say, you spend too much money on sports, because that money is more than campaigns. Are they going to say, you spend too much money on entertainment, because that is greater than the amount spent on campaigns.

We have a lot of concerns. My concerns are foreign money and campaigning on Federal property and illegal money. But, oh, my goodness, we have laws that prevent that. We have to keep this in mind, that you need to enforce existing laws.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, having joined with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BAESLER) and other members of the Blue Dog Caucus to initiate a discharge petition last October to force consideration of campaign finance reform under a fair and open process, I am very pleased to be here tonight debating a rule to bring up campaign finance reform under an open process.

The American people deserve to know where their representatives stand on the major proposals to reform our campaign finance laws. Although this rule meets the standard of openness that the Blue Dogs call for in our discharge petition, the process for considering campaign finance reform will fall far short of the standard of fairness unless we defeat the previous question and allow the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) to offer an amendment to allow the House to have clean votes on all the major proposals under a fair process.

Having worked with my Republican colleagues to use discharge petitions to force a fair debate on the balanced budget constitutional amendment and other issues, I am very disappointed that the majority did not listen to the advice of those of us who initiated the discharge petition that brought us to this point.

The Blue Dog discharge petition in the underlying rule, H. Res. 259, calls for extensive debate on leading reform

legislation followed by votes on each offered substitute.

The guiding principle behind the Blue Dog discharge petition was that we should allow clean up-or-down votes on all major campaign finance plans: the freshman bill, who worked awfully hard on their bill; the Shays-Meehan bill; the Doolittle bill; any alternative either leadership wishes to offer and any other alternatives as substitutes at the beginning of the process.

Under the king-of-the-hill process in which the amendment receiving the largest number of votes becomes the base bill for the purpose of perfecting amendments, if more than one amendment receives a majority vote, the Blue Dog discharge rule would have allowed clean votes on all amendments in the form the authors of the amendment wanted by prohibiting second degree amendments.

Let me just sum up by saying what we must do to provide for a clean and open debate is to allow all the substitutes to be submitted as those authors wish them to be submitted and vote on them and allow the one that gets the most votes to become the base bill and then allow anyone that has an amendment to offer that amendment to the base bill ultimately getting to the final package of true campaign reform. To do less than that will make another sham. We have already been through one sham in this process. To do other than that will end up with another sham.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting now that wide-open rules are considered shams when they are not getting their way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I am going to overlook the specifics and the details for a moment and just say that I am grateful to our leadership for hearing the appeal of some of us and many from the other side to give us an opportunity over the coming days and weeks to debate this issue in an open process. I think, in all fairness, it will be an open process.

But just to say that our party, the majority party here, has possibly decided to change strategy and quit running and hiding from this issue and get on the offensive and be proactive. If we disagree with our friends on the other side on the specifics, let us debate the issue, and let us have a vote on each and every substitute, and let us let majority rule. Democracy still works in this country.

Back in 1974, when this current system was brought into place, the shoe was on the other foot, and the Democrats were in charge here. They used this floor to debate these issues and bring forth what they thought were their priorities. We should do the same thing. If we have a legitimate disagreement, we should be on the offensive to say this is the way things used to be.

I am most concerned about the corrupting influences of soft money in the

American political process. Mr. Speaker, alcohol, tobacco and gambling are not the influences that I want to drive this process. They are proliferating. Millions of dollars of unregulated, unlimited soft money from some of these influences that are not good for our country or good for our children or good for this process are now dominating this business. Pretty soon, we, as candidates, will not even control the messages in our own elections if we do not do something about it.

We can have an honest disagreement about whether we should fix the current system or even possibly go back to the way things used to be before Watergate. But, most of all, we should have the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am struck by many different emotions. I do not intend to talk about the merits of the issue tonight. But I feel proud to look at Members on both sides of the aisle who, in the last 3 years, passed congressional accountability getting Congress under the same laws as the rest of the Nation. And I'm proud Republicans and Democrats working together passed gift ban and lobby disclosure legislation as well.

I am proud of the work of the Blue Dogs, and I see the gentlemen from California (Mr. FARR) and Mr. MILLER and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) who have worked hard on campaign finance reform legislators over many years.

I see other Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who helped forced this issue to come to the floor with a few Republicans. Ultimately, my leadership recognized that we did need to have a vote on campaign finance reform and I thank them for that.

It is going to be a dicey time because it is going to be truly an open debate. There is plenty of opportunity for mischief. Some can misuse the process. So reform minded Members on both sides of the aisle have got to make sure this does not happen.

I am proud also of the freshmen who made it a point to work together to find common ground. And I look forward to the next few weeks and the debate we will have.

I thank my colleagues who supported efforts to form debate and vote. And I thank my leadership for recognizing we need to have an open and honest debate. I hope and pray that, in the end, we can all be proud of the outcome.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Titanic Gingrich stall proceeding and the previous question as well as the rule.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the recent history of the Rules Committee, no other major issue has ever been subjected to such a convoluted process as campaign finance reform is being accorded;

By proposing no less than 11 substitutes, and currently considering nearly 600 amendments, a "doomsday" scenario is being presented to the American people;

Previously, the Republican leadership blocked reform efforts, made promises for floor action and reneged and delayed, brought up meaningless legislation on the suspension calendar and made a mockery of the House. Today, the effort now is to kill reform by overloading the process;

The Republican leadership is proposing an endless debate that will take us well into the summer, will result in no resolution, and will fail to bring about much needed reform;

As our colleague JOE MOAKLEY has said, "We'll just go through a lot of motion and not get any action."

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1998]

RAFT OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM PLANS
MAY MEAN LENGTHY HOUSE DEBATE

(By Helen Dewar)

Rival camps in the fight over campaign finance legislation got the official go-ahead yesterday for a free-for-all on the issue in the House that could last well into summer.

Under a procedure approved by the Rules Committee after a lengthy hearing, the House will begin debate today on a dozen plans, including alternative proposals to ban or sharply curtail the unregulated "soft money" donations to political parties at the heart of fund-raising abuses in the 1996 presidential campaign.

No votes are anticipated until after Congress returns from its Memorial Day recess, and still to be determined by the committee is the problem of how to deal with an extraordinary load of amendments, including 586 that have been filed so far.

Never in the history of the Rules Committee has it faced such a formidable load of amendments, said committee Chairman Gerald B.H. Solomon (R-N.Y.), who promised to prune the list to manageable proportions over the recess. He dismissed some lawmakers' complaints that the process could take all summer. "It could but it won't," he said. Without interruption, the bill could be wound up in four days, he added.

Only a couple of months ago, House Republican leaders resorted to extraordinary means to block votes on the leading proposals, including a total soft-money ban proposed by Reps. Christopher Shays (R-Conn.) and Martin T. Meehan (D-Mass.) and a somewhat less stringent alternative proposed by a bipartisan group of freshmen.

But their tactics created an uproar, and, in order to keep from losing control of the House on the issue, GOP leaders did a sudden about-face and opted for a wide-open process providing for votes on a multitude of plans and even more numerous amendments to them.

As a result, the reform groups, once united in opposition to the leaders' tactics, are competing against each other, raising the possibility that none of the plans would get enough votes for passage—or that all of them would get bogged down in a struggle over amendments.

Now it was Democratic leaders, as well as their Republican counterparts, who were get-

ting caught in the squeeze. Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.), who has been pushing for the Shays-Meehan bill, raised some hackles at a Democratic caucus Tuesday night when, according to several observers, he acknowledged without apparent disapproval that some Democrats would also support the freshmen's bill.

At yesterday's hearing, several lawmakers expressed concern that the debate might be stretched out over weeks, with interruptions for other business, making it little more than "filler" to plug into open spaces in the schedule. Several also objected to allowing amendments to each of the plans as they come up for votes, instead of holding them in reserve for action on the final version, saying this could lead to lethal delays. "We'll just go through a lot of motion and not [get] any action," said Rep. Joe Moakley (Mass.), ranking the committee's ranking Democrat.

[From the Roll Call, May 21, 1998]

CONGRESS INSIDE OUT

(By Norman J. Ornstein)

MESSAGE TO MEMBERS: LOOK BEYOND RHETORIC
BEFORE VOTING ON CFR

Campaign reform is back—for an extended debate in the House. The "strange bedfellows" coalition that Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky) pulled together for the Senate debate on campaign reform is alive and well—from the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) and the National Rifle Association to the ACLU.

Encouraged by House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Texas) and McConnell crony Rep. Anne Northup (R-Ky), and led by the NRLC's Douglas Johnson, this coalition has used the guise of the First Amendment to fight bitterly and unrelentingly against any reform, and in particular against any proposal that changes the free-for-all jungle surrounding all electioneering communications that do not use "magic words" like "vote for" or "vote against," and thus call themselves issue advocacy.

The coalition opposes the Shays-Meehan plan in this area, which would treat electioneering communications in the period just before an election by the same rules that apply to independent expenditures—disclosure of donors and ad sponsors, and contribution limits for groups.

It opposes with equal fervor the freshman Hutchinson-Allen plan, which is a simple, watered-down disclosure provision for a narrow category of electioneering ads that covers only sponsors, not donors—not even very large donors.

It opposed unalterably the Snowe-Jeffords Amendment in the Senate, which covered disclosure of large donors only for electronic communications of \$10,000 or more within 60 days of an election, tailored at influencing directly the election or defeat of a candidate, and banned direct electioneering contributions from labor unions and corporations.

This anti-reform coalition has already been hitting House Members hard. The NRLC has made each provision on sham issue advocacy a right-to-life test, telling Members that a vote for any reform will harm their pro-life record, a serious problem for many GOP lawmakers. The group ran harsh negative radio ads against staunchly pro-life Rep. Asa Hutchinson (R-Ark) for his temerity in supporting any disclosure for any political ads.

Using the umbrella aegis of the ACLU, the coalition will cloak itself in the First Amendment, claiming it is just for free speech. Of course, the ACLU position is simply the position of the organization's current leadership; as Burt Neuborne, a former legal director of the ACLU has pointed out, virtually every previous leader in the ACLU has

a sharply different view than the current elite in the organization on the constitutionality of campaign reform proposals.

But whatever the real civil liberties position on reform, Members of Congress should be more directly aware of what the members of this broad anti-reform coalition are for and against:

1. They are against disclosure. Some "reformers," like Rep. John Doolittle (R-Calif), claim they are for lifting all limits and stiffening disclosure, relying on the market and informed consumers to self-regulate the political and election process. This would be a worthy position for debate if it were accurate.

But Doolittle, along with the NRLC's Johnson and the ACLU's Laura Murphy and Ira Glasser, are not for full disclosure. In fact, they are opposed to any and all disclosure of sources or sponsors of any political ads except the very narrow class of those using the few magic words.

They oppose any disclosure for the more than \$150 million in ads run in 1996 that were self-labeled "issue advocacy" but, as an analytical study by the Annenberg School of Communications has shown, were candidate-centered, more harshly negative than any other category of ads, and clearly designed to elect or defeat particular candidates.

2. They are for secrecy, obfuscation and misdirection. The Annenberg study and good investigative reporting around the country in 1996 and 1997 showed that sham issue-advocacy ads were often designed to blindside candidates and to obscure deliberately the origin of the attacks. Funds often were laundered through two or more organizations, with vague names like "Citizens for Reform," making it difficult to figure out the source of the campaign electioneering messages.

Attack campaigns were often run at the end of the campaign, leaving no time for the attacked candidate or the press to uncover the source. Very likely, some candidates and/or their party campaign committees colluded with outside groups to orchestrate "issue advocacy" attacks on their opponents, leaving the attacking candidate with his or her hands clean, able to disavow the vicious attack while reaping the benefit.

Absent any disclosure, we will see a whole lot more of this approach, aimed at confusing voters and blurring responsibility and accountability. Ask yourself if confusion, surreptitiousness, irresponsibility and unaccountability are the values of the First Amendment the Framers intended to put first.

3. They are for unlimited corporate and labor involvement in electioneering. Since 1907, corporations have been barred from using their funds to influence directly the outcome of elections. The same ban has existed for labor unions and their dues since the 1940s. Corporations and labor unions can use voluntary political action committees to mobilize their executives, employees and members to get involved in electing or defeating candidates for office.

But the so-called issue-advocacy campaigns have provided a gigantic loophole to allow corporations and unions to use unlimited (and undisclosed) amounts of corporate funds and union dues to target candidates, violating the intent of those existing laws.

Of course, some conservatives are trying to have it both ways, using the backdoor approach of "paycheck protection" to cripple labor unions while leaving corporations free to do what they want to shape election results. But the best way to stop labor unions and corporations from running these campaigns is to follow the legal traditions and ban their funds from use in electioneering—an approach opposed by this coalition.

4. They are for foreign involvement in American elections. Current laws ban the use of foreign money in American campaigns. But any source of funds, foreign or domestic, can be used for these so-called "issue advocacy" campaigns. And we will never know if foreign funds, including funds from the Chinese government, are used in ads that are clearly designed to elect or defeat candidates—there is no disclosure.

So here's a message for Members of Congress as you prepare to vote on reform plans and amendments that address this sham issue advocacy. Look beyond the threats and the mantra of the First Amendment offered by opponents of any reform in this area and consider the implications of the votes you cast:

Do you really want to vote against disclosure of the authors and funders of vicious attack ads?

Do you want to be on record voting for unlimited and undisclosed use of labor union dues and funds from corporate coffers to elect or defeat candidates?

Do you want to endorse a system allowing unlimited, unregulated and undisclosed use of foreign money to influence American elections?

Of course, there are reasonable and heavy-handed, constitutional and unconstitutional, ways to approach reforming this system. The freshman plan is frankly too weak; it includes disclosure, but only of the groups sponsoring these ads, not the major sources of funds. The Shays-Meehan approach (which, in the interest of disclosure, I helped to craft) is a better one, although I fear that it will be hard to sell to the Supreme Court.

I am much more comfortable with the approach my colleagues and I subsequently devised that became the Snowe-Jeffords Amendment, which puts reasonable if broad limits on electioneering ads masquerading as "issue advocacy" by providing targeted disclosure of large contributors and keeping out corporate and labor funds.

Each of these approaches at least tries to apply the spirit and approach of the Buckley decision and a sensitivity to the First Amendment rights of issue advocates to a class of ads that are not issue advocacy and thus defy the intent of the Court. Whether too weak, too strong or just right, the zealous from the NRLC and the ACLU will be opposed.

Which side are you on?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, it is 11 o'clock, 5 minutes of 11:00, and we are now finally getting to the debate on the rule on campaign finance reform, an interesting rule that brings 11 different viewpoints to the floor, allows an hour vote for each one, and unlimited amendments.

The question is whether this Congress is going to be serious about passing campaign reform. It was just mentioned that, when our party was in control, we and the 101st, 102d, and 103rd did pass campaign reform, and it was substantive.

It was a bill that, first of all, had the premise of fairness, a bill that did not favor one party over another. Second, it reduced the influence of special interest. Third, it leveled the playing field. And, fourth, it made access to the system by nontraditional candidates.

One of the bills that is in order is a bill that does that. It caps spending. It

reduces individual PAC contributions. It reforms the role of wealthy donors and people who use their own money. It reforms the role of soft money. It finally puts the brakes on massive expenditures of money in the political realm that are now unregulated, undisclosed and outside the law, those that are independent expenditures.

I hope Members of the party will take a look at this bill. There are 106 coauthors on this side. It is the only bill that is on the floor that is really comprehensive, the only bill that addresses all the issues that the 101st, 102d, 103rd Congress did. If you adopt this rule, you will have a chance to do comprehensive campaign finance reform.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes to point out to the gentleman that just spoke in the well that all of these wonderful bills and all of the previous approaches by the Democrats in previous Congresses left out one minor piece; that is, the special interests that spend more money in politics than all the rest combined, the labor unions, which spent, in the last cycle, in the last election, somewhere between \$300 million and \$500 million according to a Rutgers University study.

Are they at all impinged by any of these bills? Of course not. That is not soft money. You see, that is Democrat money. We will not abuse it at all.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) said that the Shays-Meehan bill codifies the Beck decision. What the Beck decision says is that labor union members must approve their money being used for political activity.

This codification of the Beck decision says you may get your money back if it was used for political activity so long as you are no longer a union member, which is to say you have to leave the money to get your money back.

This is the sham. This is the game that is being played. Stop the union or stop the corporate soft money accounts. That is fine. We both get about \$140 million a year. We both get \$140 million over a 2-year cycle from three committees. But eliminate any opportunity from impinging on the labor unions which support the Democrats 100 percent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) said that the airwaves are flooded with negative political attacks. Yes, of course they were, by unions. Of course they were. He was not there stopping them. In fact, he was welcoming them.

When the unions this year decided that occasionally they would support some friendly Republicans, the Democrat leadership wrote a whining letter to the union leadership and said, do not dare support Republicans. You are our guys.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) also said that, in this process, no political voice is heard unless they

contribute up to \$50,000. It is only a rich guy's game. He may be speaking from personal experience; but from my experience, and anyone that I know, we listen to all. We hear from everyone, whether or not they are contributors. If it is his experience only to listen to those who contribute \$50,000, that is his problem, not the country's problem.

There is, indeed, an outside influence. If we are going to treat them fairly, we treat them all, including the labor union's money. But I will point out to the gentleman there is no controlling legal authority to do that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO) was going to point out that the facts of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) are wrong. We will get into that. But I take seriously your description of the issue. You say major changes are not needed to implement present law. I say implement present law and make major changes in the law. That is what you said.

Money is swamping the Democratic process and you are standing up, defending the status quo. The present system demeans the contributor. It demeans the recipient. It increases polarization, and it deepens public cynicism.

Shays-Meehan addresses both soft money and issue ads. I say to the minority who usually are not such defenders of free speech, free speech is not the same as unlimited paid campaign ads. Vote for Shays-Meehan.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the last speaker.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 6½ minutes remaining.

□ 2300

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, because it will eventually allow us to vote on campaign finance reform, though I must say that it should be called the heel-dragging rule. There is so much debate scheduled on this issue, that I am afraid it could go on for months.

While I object to this filibuster tactic, I am pleased that it will finally allow us to vote on Shays-Meehan. Shays-Meehan bans soft money, it regulates third party expenditures, it will help to level the playing field between challengers and incumbents and it encourages greater disclosure. It will help

to turn the political process back to an election, instead of an auction that is going to the highest bidder, the person who spends the most money.

Mr. Speaker, we need to show the public that our elections are not for sale, our government is not for sale, and bring in real campaign finance reform. We need to vote on it before we go back and ask our constituents to vote for us.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the message the American people are sending us is clear: Reform our campaign finance system; reform it now. The Republican leadership does not get that message. They do not want to get that message.

There was a famous handshake three years ago with President Clinton. The Speaker said he was going to have a vote on campaign finance reform. Time and again that vote has been delayed. He promised a vote in March. It is May; we are still waiting.

Keep in mind the Speaker is in charge of this House. If he wanted a vote on campaign finance reform, we would have that vote tonight. That is what we ought to be doing, instead of delay and delay on this issue. And speaking of delay, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the Republican Majority Whip, is working vigorously to kill campaign finance reform. You should clap. We all know what you are doing.

The Republican leadership thinks we need more money in this political system. They would lift current limits on campaign contributions. They would increase the influence of the wealthiest in this country.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, is hissing, and I mean this seriously if we are going to set precedent, is hissing from Members of this House in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Hissing is not proper decorum in the House, under Jefferson's manual.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the people of America to pay close attention to this debate on campaign finance reform. Pay close attention, because you will hear so many different arguments, facts, figures and legal theories, not just today, but possibly for weeks to come. There will be so much that is said that it may be hard to follow what is really important in this debate.

There is only one thing that matters when all is said and done: Will your representative in Congress vote for the only meaningful campaign finance reform bill to be offered this year? Will your representative vote for the Shays-Meehan bill? That is all that matters.

The Shays-Meehan bill is the only bill that truly bans soft money and has the support of grassroots campaign finance reform organizations. Huge soft money contributions have become the leading corrupting influence in our political process today. Soft money contributions have caused politicians to do many things that they would not ordinarily do to abandon their constituents, to abandon the taxpayer, to abandon the public interest.

My friends, ask yourself this: With all of the evidence of the corrupting influence of campaign contributions on politics, why should it be so hard to reform this system? Why should it be so hard? The answer is because the Republican leaders who control this House are committed to blocking the successful passage of campaign finance reform.

The vast majority of Democrats are committed to real reform, and we have been joined by a small group of concerned Republicans. Together, hopefully, we represent a majority. But we do not control the action on the floor. That is why, ladies and gentleman across this country, you must pay attention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Remember, there is only one way to determine whether or not your Representative truly believes and supports and is for campaign finance reform. That is, at the end of this debate, did they vote for the Shays-Meehan bill?

Mr. LINDER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, is it the regular order of the House for the gentleman to ignore the Speaker and to ignore the time limits and speak as long as he did?

Mr. MILLER of California. As did the gentleman when he just previously spoke. You were also told time expired, and you continued to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule of the House is the person speaking must cease speaking and his remarks are not transcribed when he is no longer under recognition. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the Majority Whip of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we just got—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, we have jeering back here on this side. Can we get some order in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people just saw that display, because what they saw is Big Brother on the prowl again, Big Brother government trying to stifle the American people once again, and they are not even satisfied with open and honest debate. They want the debate on their terms, voting up or down on their bills, and they do not want any amendments. Well, I look forward to having a vigorous and complete debate about the state of our campaign laws, the laws that the gentleman from California enacted around 1974.

Some believe that the laws that govern our elections are in such desperate shape that we should erect a huge government bureaucracy and sharply limit the ability of our citizens to participate through further spending limits; others believe that things are so serious that we need to scrap the First Amendment to the Constitution, the premier political reform in human history, and start all over with a new First Amendment that restrains the exuberance of the American electorate; and the president uses campaign finance reform as a way to distract the American people from his own campaign's shameless abuse of the campaign laws.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to throw the baby out with the bath water. We do not need to scrap the First Amendment simply because the Clinton campaign could not abide by our own current laws.

Some of my colleagues, with very good intentions in their hearts, have crafted legislation that would make our Founding Fathers turn in their graves. The Shays-Meehan approach is a direct assault upon the First Amendment. The Hutchinson bill is only slightly less offensive. I contend that these two bills will erect a Byzantine set of laws that will gag citizens' speech, and, as the ACLU has warned, not exactly one of my best supporters, but they have warned that this barrier would inevitably be analogous to barbed wire fences. No individual or group would try to scale it, unless they were willing to become ensnared in a complicated set of laws, whose penalties would inflict serious pain.

Now, attempts to regulate and to require disclosure of issue advocacy that has been talked about a lot here

through statute and through FEC regulation have repeatedly been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and other lower Federal courts.

□ 2310

The Court has always viewed issue advocacy as a form of speech that deserves the highest degree of protection, strict scrutiny under the First Amendment. And that Court has not only been supportive, has not only been supportive of issue advocacy, it has affirmatively stated that it is untroubled by the fact that issue advertisements may influence the outcome of an election. In fact, in *Buckley v. Valeo* the Justices stated, and I quote, and it is a wonderful quote, "The First Amendment denies government the power," denies big brother the power, "to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In a free society ordained by our Constitution, it is not the government, but the people, the people, individually, as citizens and candidates and collectively, the people as associations and political committees, they are the ones who must retain control over the quantity and the range of debate on public issues in a political campaign." Not this House, not some bureaucracy, not the FEC, not even you. The people, something we forget about in this Chamber a lot.

Freedom of speech is the issue. My friends who support Shays and other bills to restrict freedom of speech will deny that any First Amendment issue is at stake.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment is not a loophole. Freedom and reform are not mutually exclusive principles. They go hand-in-hand.

The First Amendment is not an idea that should be tossed aside like a piece of garbage. It is our first freedom. It is our most critical freedom. It is the First Amendment in America's premier political reform. We should be expanding freedom. We should be encouraging participation in the political process.

Now, many campaign reform proposals go in the other direction. They clamp down on freedom, they gag citizens, they restrict freedom. I believe that there are things we can do to improve our campaign laws. We should have full disclosure so that the American people have quicker and better access to the information that they need to make informed decisions. And the proposal of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) to require that all campaign contributions be posted on the Internet I think is an excellent way to get full disclosure.

We should cut out the bureaucracy and the paperwork so that more of our citizens feel more comfortable about running for office. We should lift up campaign limits so that middle America can solicit the support that they need to run for office, not only rich people.

We should oppose any effort to give welfare to politicians, and I urge my

colleagues to stand for freedom and join with me in protecting the First Amendment from further attack.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Meehan-Shays Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 1998. This legislation bans soft money and prevents this ban from being circumvented by loopholes and exceptions.

Campaign finance reform is essential to restoring public confidence in not only the political system but our legislative process, as evidenced by a Wall Street Journal/Hart poll in which 68% of the people questioned said they believed the American political system is more influenced by special interest money than it was 20 years ago. But we don't need polls to tell us that the American people distrust the way that soft money has infiltrated this institution. All of us in this body have heard from our constituents, and they are clamoring for reform.

Mr. Speaker, those opposed to this legislation would have us believe that the bill is unconstitutional, that it would erode our First Amendment rights to free speech. H.R. 3256 does not impinge on our constitutionally guaranteed rights to free speech. What it does do, however, is strengthen the definition of the term "campaign ad", so that groups who pay to produce and broadcast these ads must adhere to federal election laws. Specifically, under the Meehan-Shays Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, any ad run within 60 days of an election that features a clearly identified federal candidate is considered "campaigning" and will have to be paid for according to FEC guidelines.

This provision ensures that the public is fully aware of who is paying for these so-called "issue advocacy" ads. It would be applied evenly, to Republicans and Democrats, corporations and unions, individuals and organizations. Mr. Speaker, we have a limited number of legislative days remaining in the 105th Congress. We are well into the 1998 election cycle. H.R. 3256 is a reasonable and well-crafted bipartisan approach to an issue that the American people want this Congress to address as soon as possible.

Let's do the right thing, let's pass real reforms to the Congressional Campaign System. Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 190, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—208

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Pappas
Archer	Gillmor	Paxon
Armey	Gilman	Pease
Bachus	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goodlatte	Petri
Ballenger	Goodling	Pickering
Barr	Goss	Pitts
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pombo
Bartlett	Granger	Porter
Barton	Greenwood	Portman
Bass	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bilbray	Hansen	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hastert	Redmond
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Blunt	Hayworth	Riggs
Boehlert	Hill	Riley
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogan
Bono	Hobson	Rogers
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hostettler	Roukema
Buyer	Houghton	Royce
Callahan	Hulshof	Ryun
Calvert	Hunter	Salmon
Camp	Hutchinson	Sanford
Campbell	Hyde	Saxton
Cannon	Inglis	Schaefer, Dan
Castle	Istook	Schaffer, Bob
Chabot	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Chenoweth	Jones	Shadegg
Christensen	Kasich	Shays
Coble	Kelly	Shimkus
Collins	Kim	Shuster
Combest	King (NY)	Skeen
Cook	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Crane	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Crapo	LaHood	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Largent	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Latham	Solomon
Davis (VA)	LaTourette	Souder
Deal	Lazio	Spence
DeLay	Leach	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Sununu
Doolittle	Linder	Talent
Dreier	Livingston	Tauzin
Duncan	LoBiondo	Thomas
Dunn	Lucas	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCollum	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McInnis	Trafficant
English	McIntosh	Upton
Ensign	McKeon	Walsh
Everett	Metcalf	Wamp
Ewing	Mica	Watkins
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Fossella	Morella	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Myrick	Weller
Fox	Nethercutt	White
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Wolf
Galleghy	Northup	Young (AK)
Ganske	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gekas	Nussle	
Gibbons	Packard	

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Cardin	Engel
Ackerman	Carson	Eshoo
Allen	Clay	Etheridge
Andrews	Clayton	Evans
Baesler	Clyburn	Farr
Baldacci	Condit	Fattah
Barcia	Conyers	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Costello	Filner
Becerra	Coyne	Ford
Bentsen	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Berry	Cummings	Frost
Bishop	Danner	Furse
Blagojevich	Davis (FL)	Gejdenson
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gephardt
Bonior	DeGette	Gordon
Borski	Delahunt	Green
Boswell	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Boucher	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Boyd	Dingell	Hamilton
Brady (PA)	Dixon	Hastings (FL)
Brown (CA)	Doggett	Hefner
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hinchee
Capps	Edwards	Hinojosa

Holden	McGovern	Rothman
Hooley	McHale	Roybal-Allard
Hoyer	McIntyre	Rush
Jackson (IL)	McKinney	Sabo
Jackson-Lee	McNulty	Sanchez
(TX)	Meehan	Sanders
Jefferson	Meek (FL)	Sandlin
John	Menendez	Sawyer
Johnson (WI)	Millender	Schumer
Johnson, E. B.	McDonald	Scott
Kanjorski	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Kaptur	Minge	Sherman
Kennedy (MA)	Mink	Siskis
Kennedy (RI)	Moakley	Skelton
Kennelly	Mollohan	Slaughter
Kildee	Moran (VA)	Smith, Adam
Kilpatrick	Murtha	Snyder
Kind (WI)	Nadler	Spratt
Klecza	Neal	Stabenow
Klink	Oberstar	Stenholm
Kucinich	Obey	Stokes
LaFalce	Olver	Strickland
Lampson	Ortiz	Stupak
Lantos	Owens	Tanner
Lee	Pallone	Tauscher
Levin	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Thompson
Lipinski	Payne	Thurman
Lofgren	Pelosi	Tierney
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Turner
Luther	Pickett	Velazquez
Maloney (CT)	Pomeroy	Vento
Maloney (NY)	Poshard	Visclosky
Manton	Price (NC)	Waters
Markey	Rahall	Watt (NC)
Mascara	Rangel	Wexler
Matsui	Reyes	Weygand
McCarthy (MO)	Rivers	Wise
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Woolsey
McDermott	Roemer	Wynn

NOT VOTING—35

Bateman	Harman	Quinn
Berman	Hefley	Scarborough
Boehner	Herger	Shaw
Burr	Johnson, Sam	Skaggs
Burton	Manzullo	Stark
Canady	Martinez	Taylor (NC)
Clement	McCrery	Torres
Coburn	McDade	Towns
DeFazio	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Deutsch	Oxley	Wicker
Foley	Parker	Yates
Gonzalez	Paul	

□ 2333

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PICKERING and Mr. KNOLLENBERG changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present to you the 32nd annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH),

the Federal agency charged with advancing scholarship and knowledge in the humanities. The NEH supports an impressive range of humanities projects advancing American scholarship and reaching millions of Americans each year.

The public has been enriched by many innovative NEH projects. These included a traveling exhibit, companion book, and public programming examining the history and legacy of the California Gold Rush on the occasion of its Sesquicentennial. Other initiatives promoted humanities radio programming and major funding for the critically acclaimed PBS series, "Liberty! The American Revolution."

The NEH is also utilizing computer technologies in new and exciting ways. Answering the call for quality humanities content on the Internet, NEH partnered with MCI to provide EDSITEMent, a website that offers scholars, teachers, students, and parents a link to the Internet's most promising humanities sites. The NEH's "Teaching with Technology" grants have made possible such innovations as a CD-ROM on art and life in Africa and a digital archive of community life during the Civil War. In its special report to the Congress, "NEH and the Digital Age," the agency examined its past, present, and future use of technology as a tool to further the humanities and make them more accessible to the American public.

This past year saw a change in leadership at the Endowment. Dr. Sheldon Hackney completed his term as Chairman and I appointed Dr. William R. Ferris to succeed him. Dr. Ferris will continue the NEH's tradition of quality research and public programming.

The important projects funded by the NEH provide for us the knowledge and wisdom imparted by history, philosophy, literature, and other humanities disciplines, and cannot be underestimated as we meet the challenges of the new millennium.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 21, 1998.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before recognizing Members for 5-minute special orders, the Chair will recognize 1-minute requests, but not beyond midnight.

TOBACCO LEGISLATION

(Mr. GOODE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending before both Houses of Congress that would raise the excise tax on tobacco products by \$1.50 per pack. As a practical matter, these proposals result in a total tax increase of at least \$500 billion over 25 years. This tax increase of a half trillion dollars

will fall most heavily on the American working men and women. Those who make \$30,000 per year pay 43 percent of the Federal tobacco tax burden.

□ 2340

The median income in the Fifth District of Virginia, which I represent, is less than \$28,000 per year. In fact, if this excise tax of \$1.50 per pack goes in, the Federal tax burden on the Virginia family in the Fifth District would be more than \$500 per year, and that is a staggering tax increase for a family that is struggling to make ends meet.

HONORING FORMER SOUTH VIETNAMESE ARMY COMMANDOS

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House Committee on National Security unanimously approved my amendment to honor and recognize the former South Vietnamese army commandos who were employees of the United States Government during the Vietnam War.

Today, the Members of this House had the opportunity to properly honor those brave men by supporting the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1999.

Last year, the President signed into law legislation that I advocated to ensure that the United States Government honor a 30-year-old bad debt and pay these men who worked for the United States Government the wages they earned but were denied during the Vietnam War.

These individuals were trained by the Pentagon to infiltrate and destabilize communist North Vietnam.

Many of these commandos were captured and tortured while in prison for 15 to 20 years, and many never made it out.

Declassified DOD documents showed that U.S. officials wrote off the commandos as dead even though they knew from various sources that many were alive in Vietnamese prisons.

The documents also show that U.S. officials lied to the soldiers' wives, paid them tiny "Death Gratuities" and washed their hands of the matter.

For example, Mr. Ha Va Son was listed as dead by our Government in 1967, although he was known to be in a communist prison in North Vietnam. Today he is very much alive and well and living in Chamblee, GA. In my hand I hold the United States Government's official declaration of his death.

Because it was a secret covert operation, the U.S. Government thought they could easily ignore the commandos, their families, friends, and their previous contacts without anyone noticing.

As the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania said in a recent hearing, "This is a genuinely incredible story of callous, inhumane, and really barbaric treatment by the United States."

In the 104th Congress, this House approved legislation that required the Department of Defense to pay reparations to the commandos.